

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, the claims have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 13, 17, 19 and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,049,821 to Theriault et al. in view of U.S. patent 6,065,055 to Hughes et al. The Examiner has further rejected claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault et al., in view of Hughes et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0023671 to Abdulrahiman et al. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault et al. in view of Hughes et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0126086 to Safadi. Moreover, the Examiner has rejected claims 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault et al. in view of Hughes et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143780 to Gorman. Finally, the Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault et al. in view of Hughes et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078161 to Cheng.

The Theriault et al. patent discloses a proxy host computer and method for accessing and retrieving information between a browser and a proxy, in which a proxy situated between a browser and an information source receives queries from the browser

and responses (to queries) from the information source, the proxy being able to filter the queries from the browser and/or filter the responses from the information source. The proxy may further save the queries and/or responses.

The Hughes et al. patent discloses an inappropriate site management software, which includes incrementing the filter hits during scan intervals, i.e., periodic filtering.

Claim 13 (as well as claim 25) includes:

"A method of filtering and storing information about content stored on at least one network device and accessible via a network, said content being potentially useable by a plurality of network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the method comprising the steps of:

a) periodically filtering information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices;

b) storing, in a content directory, the filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by said at least one network rendering device; and

c) searching or browsing the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device;

wherein said searching or browsing of the content directory to review said filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network

rendering device, is performed independently of said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of content that cannot be rendered by the at least one network rendering device."

The Examiner has indicated that the step "periodically filtering information about the content to yield filtered information..." is taught by Theriault at col. 5, lines 6-9 and 13-17, "Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device - Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services, i.e. filtering said information".

Applicants believe that the Examiner misunderstands the subject invention. In particular, of course the filtered information lacks "content", in that the filtered information only contains information about the content (stored separately). With regard to the filtering step, this renders filtered information "devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device" (emphasis added). It appears that the Examiner is presuming that the user knows the limitations of his own rendering device in that the user selects the filtering of services. However, the claim is not based on the single rendering device of the particular user generating a query. Rather, the filtering being performed eliminates information about content that cannot be rendered by any one of the network rendering devices. Put in another way, all of the rendering devices are able to render the content being referred to by the filtered information.

Applicants submit that in order for the user to be able to generate the appropriate query, it must be presumed that the user has knowledge of the capabilities of all of the network rendering devices including the user's network rendering device. However, such knowledge is neither shown nor suggested by Theriault.

Applicants further submit that this limitation is absent from Hughes et al.

Claim 14 includes the limitation "wherein content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices comprises content having a format that is not compatible with the at least one network rendering device", while claim 15 includes the limitation "wherein content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices comprises content having a transport protocol that is not compatible with the at least one network rendering device".

The Abdulrahiman et al. publication discloses a wireless information transmission system and method, in which an electronic device contains a listing 150 of supported or compatible data formats and a plurality of applications or programs 155. The listing 150 may be maintained in the electronic device and may be forwarded to a proxy server.

The Examiner has indicated that Abdulrahiman et al. discloses the limitations of claims 14 (page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, paragraph [0039], lines 3-5) and 15 (page 3, paragraph [0030], lines 6-11, paragraph [0031], lines 5-6).

Applicants submit that Abdulrahiman et al. teaches, with regard to claim 14, the possible existence of content having a format that is incompatible with a particular electronic device. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of using the listings 150 of all of the electronic devices to in order to perform the step "periodically filtering information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices" as set forth in claim 13.

With regard to claim 15, while Abdulrahiman et al. teaches that there exists a transport protocol to enable transmission between the electronic device and the proxy server, this does not relate to whether there is information about content having an incompatible transport protocol, and that this information is filtered out in said filtering step of claim 13.

The Safadi publication discloses methods and apparatus for digital rights management.

The subject invention, as claimed in claim 16, includes the limitation "wherein content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices, comprises content having a DRM system that is not supported by the at least one network rendering device."

The Examiner has indicated that Safadi teaches this limitation and points out page 2, paragraph 21, lines 1-2.

Applicants believe that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, the noted section of Safadi states "The present

invention provides methods and apparatus for digital rights management (DRM)." However, referring to the ensuing lines 2-8, Safadi states "In particular, the present invention enables digital rights management of content from a plurality of content providers so that content protected by various DRM schemes may be downloaded, played and/or viewed from a single consumer device, without regard to the original DRM scheme used to protect the content." As such, if Saladi were to be applied to the subject invention, then there would not be any content that would meet the limitation of claim 16. In other words, Saladi teaches away from the subject invention.

Further, Applicants submit that Saladi does not disclose that which is missing from Theriault et al. and Hughes et al., i.e., "periodically filtering information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices".

The Gorman publication teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data.

Claim 18 includes the limitation "wherein said periodic filtering of information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices, is performed when a network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices is removed from the network."

As noted by the Examiner, Gorman states, on page 4, paragraph 55, lines 12-14: "It is noted that the sorting priority list can be updated to reflect that the user deleted filter criteria from the filter cells."

However, Applicants submit that Gorman does not supply that which is missing from Theriault et al. and Hughes et al., i.e., "periodically filtering information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices".

The Cheng publication discloses a UPnP enabling device for heterogeneous networks of slave devices.

Claim 21, includes the limitation "wherein the network is a UPnP network, and the information about the content is stored by an UPnP content directory service."

The Examiner indicates that Cheng teaches this limitation, and points out page 2, paragraph [0018], lines 1-5, and Fig. 1.

Applicants have reviewed this section of Cheng, as well as the entire document, and there is no mention of "content directory service". Further, Applicants submit that Cheng does not supply that which is missing from Theriault et al. and Hughes et al., i.e., "periodically filtering information about the content to yield filtered information devoid of information about content that cannot be rendered by at least one network rendering device of the plurality of network rendering devices".

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is not rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 13-27, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611